

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

10795

be a party to any movement that will result in your people and mine paying 25 to 50 percent or more, additional, for various food items because the Congress had not given our Government the authority to negotiate with our sister Republic of Mexico for bringing in a supply of supplemental labor in those instances where there is a shortage of domestic farmworkers to do this work?"

If this law is not extended, a shortage of workers will result, forcing food prices upward appreciably. We have but to look at the actual facts in comparing the price of Florida oranges in the year 1963 as compared to 1962. In the year 1962 for the week ending May 5, there were 508 carlot equivalents in 41 cities available, and the cost was \$4.55 a box. For the week ending May 4, 1963, there were only 190 carlot equivalents in Florida oranges and the price was more than doubled. They cost \$9.63 a box. This was due to a shortage of supply due to inclement weather which was the result of a spring freeze. The same price rise will occur due to a short labor supply. The gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] and I are introducing bills calling for a 3-year phaseout of this program. This type of proposal was presented by Mr. McGOVERN, of South Dakota, in 1960, which provided for a 5-year phaseout. It is most urgent that Congress act at this session on extending this most essential law.

Let us look at snapbeans: For the week ending April 30, 1963, there were 249 carlot equivalents in 41 cities. The price was \$4.50 a bushel. In the week ending May 1, 1962, there were 167 carlot equivalents in these cities and the price was \$6 a bushel.

Let us look at cucumbers now where the situation by years was reversed. The carlot supply in 41 cities in 1963 was 317, and the price was \$5 a bushel, but a year earlier, for the week ending May 1, 1962, there were only 157 carlots available in the same cities, and the price was \$9 a bushel.

These figures were taken from the USDA Weekly Summary of Shipments.

These are indications of what will happen if Public Law 78 is not extended which would give these Mexican workers an opportunity to come to America and pour back the dollars to the various provinces in the Republic of Mexico. Without this legislation, there would be a loss to Mexico of some \$35 million per year, based on the number who entered this country in 1962. No wonder the Mexican people and its Government are troubled over the failure to enact Public Law 78 extension, which has built strong the good will and understanding between the two friendly countries.

The bill and calculations of the average number of workers to enter the country for various years follow:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 510 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 510. For the calendar years 1964, 1965, and 1966, the number of workers made available for employment under this title shall not exceed 50 per centum of the average number of workers made available in the three

immediately preceding fiscal years, and in no event more than 150,000 in 1964, 120,000 in 1965 and 90,000 in 1966, and no workers shall be made available hereunder after December 31, 1966."

Approximate limitations under proposed bill

Fiscal year	Workers	3-year average	Available
1961.....	303,242		
1962.....	323,826		
1963 (estimated).....	224,000	306,589	1964—152,795
1964 (estimated).....	185,000	241,175	1965—123,583
1965 (estimated).....	158,000	189,666	1966—91,833

CUBA
(Mr. BATTIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include the text of a joint resolution on Cuba.)

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution dealing with Cuba and subversion in the Western Hemisphere.

The resolution is simple and direct. It reinstates the Monroe Doctrine and declares that Soviet presence in this hemisphere is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

This resolution was adopted in Denver by the Republican National Committee.

We can no longer, as a government, hesitate with a policy on Cuba. We must reassert our leadership in the field and follow the actions of Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower, in stating that the Monroe Doctrine is fundamental to our foreign policy.

I reject completely the idea that in our time the doctrine is dead or modified.

The joint resolution follows:

TEXT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION ON CUBA
Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere

President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

In pursuance of this application of the Monroe Doctrine, the United States protested against the movement of Spanish troops into Santo Domingo in 1861 and demanded the withdrawal of French military forces from Mexico in 1866.

The Government of the United States warned in 1940 that assumption of control of any part of the American continents by Axis Powers would violate the Monroe Doctrine.

The American States agreed at Caracas May 28, 1954, that "the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of any extra-continental power would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America."

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles asserted June 30, 1954, that "the intrusion of Soviet despotism (in Guatemala) was a direct challenge to our Monroe Doctrine, the first and most fundamental of our foreign

policies," and with the assistance of the United States, loyal Guatemalans removed their Communist rulers forthwith.

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter declared on August 24, 1960, at San Jose "any Communist regime established in any one of the American Republics would in effect constitute foreign intervention in the Americas."

The foreign ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 declared: "The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extra-continental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union."

The international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence.

In the light of the foregoing facts: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

(a) That the United States regards the Monroe Doctrine as continuing to be fundamental to its foreign policies;

(b) That the United States regards the existence of a military base in Cuba supported by Soviet equipment and Soviet personnel as a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine;

(c) That the objectives of the policy of the United States with relation to Cuba must be—

1. Termination of Soviet intervention;
2. Establishment of conditions under which the Cuban people may freely exercise their right of self-determination;
3. An end to Communist subversion, sabotage and guerrilla warfare against the people of the Western Hemisphere.

RESTATEMENT AND FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF MONROE DOCTRINE RELATING TO CUBA AND COMMUNIST SUBVERSION CALLED FOR

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN], chairman of the Republican Task Force on Cuba and Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere, having the privilege myself of being vice chairman of this task force, in calling for the restatement and full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine. The Republican policy committee and the Republican National Committee have recently endorsed this position.

I am particularly encouraged that this position, as reaffirmed by the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Montana, is firmly announced by the Republican Party, having introduced a similar resolution, House Joint Resolution 227 on February 4, 1963. It is becoming more and more obvious that the New Frontier is seeking "accommodations" with the Communists, throughout the world as well as in this hemisphere.

10796

The aim of today's resolution and House Joint Resolution 227 is the implementing of such political, diplomatic, economic or military action as may be necessary to enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout this hemisphere.

The failure of the President to take any firm and meaningful action with regard to the Communist threat in Cuba and throughout this hemisphere makes it incumbent upon the Congress to express its position in a resolution of this nature.

I do not believe the American people or the Congress can long condone the New Frontier apathy that exists towards this very real threat to the peace and security of all the Americas—which is leading the United States toward a coexistence accommodation with Communism.

The President has recently called for a "reexamination of our attitude toward the Soviet Union." Our reexamination should be one looking toward a tougher policy.

In light of the recent reports by the Organization of American States, the Stennis committee and Selden subcommittee reports, pointing to Communist infiltration and subversion in this hemisphere, a reaffirmation and implementation of the Monroe Doctrine would be an obvious necessary start toward a tougher, more realistic policy toward Soviet influence in this hemisphere.

I am gravely and deeply concerned about the signs that point toward seeking an "accommodation," an expression used by the President at his American University commencement address this year in redefining the New Frontier foreign policies, in calling also for a reexamination of our attitude toward the Soviet Union—in Cuba and elsewhere.

I am concerned when we open up commercial air corridors to nonscheduled airlines owned and operated by Castro's Communist government over the United States as was done a few weeks ago by a regulation of the FAA—so long as these planes going to and from Canada, trading with Canada which is a country for transshipment from many of the Iron Curtain countries, stop in one of our major cities for inspection—one of which is Dulles Airport outside Washington, D.C. Thus, Castro's planes can be flying over and landing within a few miles of the Nation's Capital. Apparently the quid pro quo for this "accommodation" is that Cuba will now guarantee safety of U.S. commercial airplanes over Cuba and the FAA has issued an order permitting such flights.

Perhaps this is why the New Frontier is so unconcerned about Russian trawlers violating our territorial waters.

Perhaps this is why little is being done to discourage other free nations from trading with Cuba—a practice that is ever increasing in recent weeks. I cite as justification for this Monroe Doctrine resolution introduced today and House Joint Resolution 227 the second interim report of the Subcommittee on Special Projects on Cuba and Subversion in the Western Hemisphere which follows:

SECOND INTERIM REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CUBA AND SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE—A TASK FORCE OF THE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL PROJECTS

PREAMBLE

Within the past week the President of the United States has made a foreign policy address calling for a reexamination of the attitude of Americans toward the Soviet Union. The theme of this address was that the Soviet Union could be led to adopt a more enlightened attitude if the United States changed its attitude toward peace and put aside its belief that the Russian people are lacking in virtue.

It must be presumed that the purpose of the President in making his remarks of June 10 was to indicate the direction of American foreign policy. We believe that the President is completely wrong in believing that the attitude of the American public toward the Soviet Union is a major cause of the Nation's conflict with communism and that Khrushchev's heart can be melted if this Nation adopts a more cordial attitude toward him.

It seems to us tragically irrelevant for the President to urge upon the Nation a deeper admiration of the Soviet Union for such attributes as courage and industry at a time when the ink is hardly dry on an OAS report declaring "intervention by Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere, by way of Cuba, has increased considerably during the past year."

The report which follows is offered in the hope that it will direct attention back to the type of basic decision that must be made by the leaders of this Nation in order to win the cold war.

SECOND INTERIM REPORT

The Nation needs a Cuban policy. It has no Cuban policy primarily because the President and the Democratic Congress have failed to make up their minds about the Nation's goal.

To a President who is fond of nautical metaphors, we say that a course cannot be charted until the port which we want to reach has been determined. Until the destination has been firmly fixed, the Nation will continue to drift.

The statements so far issued by administration leaders to define the goal of Cuban policy have been ambiguous, inconsistent, and incomplete. The joint congressional resolution signed by the President on October 3, 1962—perhaps the most authoritative statement of the national policy goal—is deficient in clarity, in comprehensiveness, and in courage.

Consequently, the Congress should adopt, and the President should sign, a new joint resolution stating the goal of the policy of the United States toward Communist Cuba.

THE AMBIGUITY OF THE GOAL OF CUBAN POLICY

The joint congressional resolution, like the President's statements of September 4 and 13, 1962, expresses opposition to the establishment in Cuba of an offensive military capability which threatens the security of the United States or of other nations in the hemisphere. It expresses opposition to the export of communism to other Latin American nations by force or the threat of force.

It is silent, however, on the attitude of the United States toward a Soviet military presence in Cuba which is defensive in character or which does not immediately threaten the security of the United States or of other American nations. It is silent on the attitude of the United States toward Communist subversion carried on by means other than the use or threat of force.

Many of the statements that relate to our Nation's goals are open to the interpretation that this Nation is ready to coexist with a Communist Cuba if it or Cuba does not seek

to impose communism on other nations.¹ They suggest that a Soviet presence in Cuba which does not involve offensive weapons, though abnormal, is something which our Nation can live with.

Confusion about the objective of our national policy is reflected in the utterance of the President as well as in those of lesser leaders of the administration. The President has refrained from reaffirming or repudiating the Monroe Doctrine but has offered a truncated version of the doctrine, which one administration lieutenant called the Kennedy doctrine.² The President spoke boldly before the released Cuban prisoners about the return of their flag to a free Havana in Miami in December 1962. But, less than 3 months later, at San Jose he omitted from his remarks the statements in his prepared text calling for a restoration of freedom to Cuba. The Vice President said, "We want to get rid of Castro," only to have this declaration revised by McGeorge Bundy to read "we cannot sympathize" with Castro's "course of policy" and "we must range ourselves" against it.³

From time to time the administration has given the impression that the presence of Soviet troops and military equipment in Cuba produces important advantages for the United States. Sometimes it is said that the Soviet presence makes Cuba "a showcase of Communist failure" and turns the people of other Latin American states away from Communists. Sometimes it is said that the maintenance of Soviet forces in Cuba imposes an economic strain on the Communist world. Sometimes it is said that the Soviets exercise a restraining influence on the volatile Cuban Government.

The inadequacies of statements of policy would be less important if the actions of the administration revealed a consistent and purposeful movement toward a clearly recognized objective. But the actions of the administration have been as inconsistent as its words.

The Attorney General, who said in April 1961, "The neutrality laws were never designed to prevent individuals from leaving the United States to fight for a cause in which they believe" has confined a score of Cuban exile leaders to the Miami areas. He has shown great vigor in providing immunity from exile attack to Cuba and to Cuban shipping. The President, who declared that the quarantine of last October would be maintained until United Nations inspection of the withdrawal of Soviet missiles was obtained, ended the quarantine without securing on-

¹ The uncertainty about the Nation's objectives is evidenced in a recent report from Freedom House entitled "What Can We Do About Cuba?" The report, stating the consensus of the deliberations of 25 experts on Cuba in late April 1963, declares that the following are troubling questions: "Is American Cuban policy geared to a negotiated accord with Khrushchev on the kind of Cuba with which the United States could coexist?" Is the administration "looking toward some kind of reconciliation, perhaps on the basis of a Tito-type arrangement for Cuba?"

² "The President has been careful not to declare openly that the Monroe Doctrine either does not apply in the Cuban case at this particular time or that it is an obsolete political concept in terms of present-day realities. But the administration spokesmen have made it fairly clear that the President does not believe that the Monroe Doctrine is really applicable under the present circumstances." Ted Szulc, New York Times, Sept. 23, 1962.

³ "Issues and Answers" ABC-TV Oct. 14, 1962.

site inspection to verify the removal of the missiles.

There can be no doubt that the administration would prefer that the Soviet Union pull out of Cuba and that it hopes that Castro will disappear. This wishful thinking, however, does not constitute a policy goal. There is a world of difference between a wish that the existing situation change and a determination to do all within our power to bring about a change.

A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW CUBAN RESOLUTION

This Nation has a historic policy opposing intervention in this hemisphere by despotism based in other parts of the world—a policy laid down on December 2, 1823, by James Monroe.

President Monroe asserted that "we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing" Latin American states "or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any light, than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." He warned that "we should consider any attempt" on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The Monroe Doctrine barred any further "interposition" by European powers to extend their system or exercise control in this hemisphere. It said simply, "Hands off." It made no distinction between offensive and defensive weapons or between forcible and pacific means of intervention.

The purpose of the Monroe Doctrine, as Elihu Root once explained, was to prevent the development of a situation that could endanger hemispheric security. The Kennedy doctrine, by contrast, appears to permit intervention by non-American states in this hemisphere up to the point at which a danger to security has reached an acute stage. The difference between the Monroe Doctrine and the Kennedy doctrine is the difference between preventative medical care and treatment which begins after the development of a high fever.

In earlier periods of our history the Government of the United States asserted that the Monroe Doctrine barred the presence of Spanish troops in Santo Domingo and the establishment of a French puppet emperor in Mexico. In 1940 Secretary of State Cordell Hull served notice that the Monroe Doctrine prohibited the exercise on any authority by Axis Powers over any part of the hemisphere.⁴ In 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt extended the Monroe Doctrine to Greenland and sent American troops to that island to forestall Nazi occupation.

In 1912, when Mexico proposed leasing to a Japanese fishing company, a port area in Lower California, the U.S. Senate, relying on the Monroe Doctrine, asserted, " * * * when any harbor or other place in the American continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military

purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another government, not American, as to give that government practical power of control for national purposes."

In 1954 Secretary of State John Foster Dulles declared that "the intrusion of Soviet despotism (in Guatemala) was a direct challenge to our Monroe Doctrine, the first and most fundamental of our foreign policies." With the assistance of the United States, loyal Guatemalans removed their Communist rulers forthwith.

Along with the United States, the other nations of the hemisphere have used the language of Monroe to serve notice that trespassing is forbidden to communism. The Ninth Inter-American Conference at Bogotá in 1948 condemned "interference by any foreign power, or by any political organization serving the interest of a foreign power, in the public life of the nations of the American Continent." The 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas in 1954 declared that "the domination of control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of any extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America."

Three years ago Khrushchev told the world that the Monroe Doctrine was dead, saying "the remains of this doctrine should be buried as every dead body is, so that it does not poison the air by its decay." The Eisenhower administration replied, " * * * the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed." The Kennedy administration has so far failed to contradict Khrushchev either by word or by deed.

What is needed is the positive policy of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine is being violated by the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba—whatever their strength, whatever the nature of their equipment.

The doctrine is being violated as long as there is any type of Soviet intervention in Cuba.

The removal of Soviet troops and the elimination of other types of Soviet intervention in Cuba is an urgent policy objective.

The ultimate objective of U.S. policy must be the elimination of the Communist regime in Cuba and its replacement by a government freely chosen by the Cuban people. Let the President and the Congress act.

APPENDIX I—ATTITUDES ON THE SCOPE AND STATUS OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE BY RESPONSIBLE SPOKESMEN OF THE LAST FOUR ADMINISTRATIONS

Franklin D. Roosevelt (1933-45), Cordell Hull, July 5, 1940:

"The Monroe Doctrine is solely a policy of self-defense, which is intended to preserve the independence and integrity of the Americas. It was, and is, designed to prevent aggression in this hemisphere on the part of any non-American power, and likewise to make impossible any further extension to this hemisphere of any non-American system of government imposed from without. * * * It made clear that the future transfer of existing possessions to another non-American state would be regarded as inimical to the interests of this hemisphere. This has become a basic policy of the Government of the United States."

Cordell Hull, April 12, 1940:

"There is an express application of the Monroe Doctrine by the United States regarding Greenland. There appears to be no serious question about Greenland forming part of this hemisphere as contradistin-

guished from the European side of the Atlantic. * * * The German forces occupying Denmark could easily cause the Government of Denmark to issue orders about Greenland, as they could about Danish shipping throughout the world. For this reason it's important that Greenland should receive our attention under the Monroe Doctrine."

Public Law 32, 77th Congress, approved April 19, 1941:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (1) That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power."

Harry S. Truman (1945-53), President Truman, December 27, 1945:

"We believe that the sovereign states of the Western Hemisphere, without interference from outside the Western Hemisphere, must work together as good neighbors in the solution of their common problems."

President Truman, April 5, 1947:

"When we hear the cry of freedom arising from the shores beyond our own, we can take heart from the words of Thomas Jefferson. In his letter to President Monroe, urging the adoption of what we now know as the Monroe Doctrine, he wrote: 'Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another.'

"We, like Jefferson, have witnessed atrocious violations of the rights of nations.

"We, too, have regarded them as occasions not to be slighted.

"We, too, have declared our protest.

"We must make that protest effective by aiding those peoples whose freedoms are endangered by foreign pressures.

"We must take a positive stand. It is no longer enough merely to say, 'We don't want war'. We must act in time—ahead of time—to stamp out the smoldering beginnings of any conflict that may threaten to spread over the world."

Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953-61), John Foster Dulles, June 30, 1954:

"This intrusion of Soviet despotism [in Guatemala] was, of course, a direct challenge to our Monroe Doctrine, the first and most fundamental of our foreign policies."

John Foster Dulles, June 30, 1954:

"If world communism captures any American State, however small, a new and perilous front is established which will increase the danger to the entire free world and require even greater sacrifices from the American people."

John Foster Dulles, March 4, 1954:

"It is time to make it clear with finality that we see that alien (i.e., Communist) despotism is hostile to our ideals, that we unitedly deny it the right of prey upon our hemisphere and that if it does not heed our warning and keep away we shall deal with it as a situation that might endanger the peace of American * * *. There is no place here for political institutions which served alien masters."

Henry Cabot Lodge, June 20, 1954:

"I say to you, representative of the Soviet Union, stay out of this hemisphere and don't try to start your plans and your conspiracies over here."

Department of State, July 14, 1960:

"The principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the Doctrine was proclaimed."

John F. Kennedy (1961 to date), John F. Kennedy, September 13, 1962:

"Question. Will it require force to contravene the Monroe Doctrine or does the presence of a foreign power in any force, but not using that force in this hemisphere, amount to contravention of the Doctrine?"

⁴It is interesting to note that the argument used by Hitler's government and rejected by Hull in 1940, contending that U.S. participation in the affairs of Europe made the Monroe Doctrine obsolete, was adopted by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN.

"The nonintervention in the affairs of the American Continent by European nations which is demanded by the Monroe Doctrine can in principle be legally valid only on condition that the American nations for their part do not interfere in the affairs of the European Continent," Von Ribbentrop, July 1, 1940.

"This change has greatly altered the conditions governing our implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was based in part on the assumption that the nations of the Western Hemisphere would remain uninvolved in the conflicts of Europe," Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Sept. 20, 1962.

"The President. Well, I have indicated that if Cuba should possess a capacity to carry out offensive action against the United States, that the United States would act. I have also indicated that the United States would not permit Cuba to export its power by force in the hemisphere."

Congressman WAYNE HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, September 28, 1962:

"I think if a determination is made that the buildup in Cuba reaches a point where it is a threat to the United States, then it is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine."

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, September 20, 1962:

"This change has greatly altered the conditions governing our implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was based in part on the assumption that the nations of the Western Hemisphere would remain uninvolved in the conflicts of Europe. But in discharging our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine, we must act with full regard for the fact that the problem of Cuba and of Communist designs in the Western Hemisphere is not an isolated one but part of our worldwide struggle against Communist imperialism."

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico, September 20, 1962:

"* * * how can we justify saying we object to the Russians being in Cuba when we have a base within 60 miles of the Russian border in Turkey? I have been at our airbase in Turkey, 60 miles from Russia. How can we justify that and at the same time object to the Russians being in Cuba?"

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, September 20, 1962:

"The Monroe Doctrine has been altered because we have foreign commitments and responsibilities."

"I submit, therefore, that we can neither morally nor realistically take action which would jeopardize the security and independence of our allies."

"It is not the same Monroe Doctrine as that of 1823; and our historians have been reporting that fact to us for some decades. They are correct."

Congressman CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, September 26, 1962:

"The Monroe Doctrine of 150 years ago has been amended by the necessity of a Kennedy doctrine which recognizes that a few sailing ships and men armed with muskets differs critically from a thoughtless armed action which can escalate into a nuclear holocaust and incinerate the Western Hemisphere."

Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, September 28, 1962:

Mr. HOLLAND inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which was entitled, "Monroe: Obsolete Doctrine." The editorial said, "The Monroe Doctrine is Dead." Congressman HOLLAND called it (p. A 178) "An excellent editorial on the present 'hot' cold-war situation. * * * It is good to know that we have responsible and levelheaded publishers and editors throughout the Nation who are dedicated to reporting the facts."

Mr. Frank L. King of Long Prairie, Minn., took note of the situation and promptly sent me the following letter which, even with tongue in cheek, portrays the foolish and unwarranted actions we have noted from the Area Redevelopment Administration since its inception. I respectfully submit Mr. King's letter.

JUNE 13, 1963.

HON. ODIN LANGEN,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANGEN: I have been giving some thought to means of replacement of the loss that the Red River Valley will sustain, and is sustaining, as a result of the Department of Agriculture and the Area Redevelopment Administration withholding a 50,000-ton sugarbeet allotment for the purpose of experimenting with sugarbeet raising in Cayuga County, N.Y., and I have suddenly found the answer.

While poking around in my garden last evening, I dug up a peanut. Now if I can dig a peanut out of the ground in my garden without even having planted one, just think of what would happen if I planted them. Instead of the ARA making a grant of \$118,000, as it did to experiment with beets in Cayuga County, N.Y., I would be willing to conduct an extended experiment with peanuts in Todd County, Minn., for \$118. Perhaps with a slight additional grant I could experiment with the idea of growing a peanut already salted in the shell, or perhaps with a further grant I could experiment with growing precoasted peanuts. Now, at first blush you may not consider my ideas as practical, but I beg of you to give them serious consideration with a view toward submitting to the Department of Agriculture and the Area Redevelopment Administration, because if these departments can be convinced that the ideas are feasible, then they have to be feasible, if you will but consider the infallibility of the New Frontier's ideas of "getting this country moving."

Now the question arises: What will we do with all of the peanuts we will raise in Todd County? I have that problem solved also. My idea should gain very popular support from legislators who are so dependent upon and are dictated to by labor leaders. Instead of spending \$20 million for a plant, to be paid for with taxpayer's money, we could find lots of space for the employment of many people to hand-shell the peanuts, and the finished product could then be purchased by the government and the many thousands of additional employees that are being taken on by the Department of Agriculture since the inauguration of the New Frontier could be paid their monthly salary with the finished product. This would in no way detract from the Cayuga County project, because peanuts will not serve as a substitute for sugar.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK L. KING.

mittee—whereby negotiations could be carried on without the pressure of the termination of the agreement. This built-in contractual procedure emphasizes that collective bargaining is a continuing process and should not be left to the tension generated during the last few weeks prior to the end of the labor contract.

President McDonald of the United Steelworkers of America should be congratulated for leading his union in this pioneering endeavor to perfect the institution of free collective bargaining without reliance upon Government intervention. It has certainly broken with the procedures followed in past negotiations with the steel industry and should reassure the American people that the public interest can be best served by collective bargaining. I enclose a copy of the statement passed by the wage policy committee which spells out the terms of the agreement.

STATEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL WAGE POLICY COMMITTEE, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, JUNE 20, 1963

I

After the great steel strike of 1959, the United Steelworkers of America and the major steel companies came to realize that a drastic change would have to be made in the nature of their relationship if a repetition of that experience was to be avoided. Accordingly, it was agreed that a joint study committee would be established, to be known as the human relations research committee, which would attempt during the term of the agreement to study the mutual problems of the parties and to arrive at mutually satisfactory solutions. It was hoped that this device would make possible a more thorough exploration of problems in a more cooperative atmosphere, free of the pressure of imminent deadlines. The wage policy committee wholeheartedly endorsed this effort to find a new approach to collective bargaining.

This imaginative experiment bore its first fruits in 1962. In that year, the United Steelworkers of America and the 11 major steel companies made a historic agreement—months in advance of the expiration date of the 1959 agreement—which was based in large part upon the work which had been done by the human relations research committee.

Not surprisingly, the 1962 agreements provided for the continuation of the human relations research committee, under the name of human relations committee, on a greatly expanded basis. A number of very broad, difficult and important problems were specifically referred to that committee for study.

Since the principal problem facing our members is the problem of unemployment, most of the issues which were referred to the human relations committee were issues affecting job and income security. These included the following:

1. The creation of employment opportunities through vacations of longer duration.
2. The contracting out of work which could be performed by bargaining unit employees.
3. The scheduling of overtime work for some employees while others are on layoff or working less than a full 40-hour week.
4. The performance by supervisors of work normally performed by bargaining unit employees.
5. The assignment to employees outside the bargaining unit of work which has been or could be performed by bargaining unit employees.

ARA, SUGARBEETS AND PEANUTS

(Mr. LANGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently called your attention, and to the attention of my colleagues, how the Area Redevelopment Administration was getting into the sugarbeet business by granting technical studies designed to prove the feasibility of growing beets in areas of questionable suitability, while proven beet areas continue to beg for acreage allotments.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT STEEL CONTRACT

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, despite continued charges that collective bargaining has broken down the United Steelworkers of America has concluded an unprecedented agreement in that it was conducted without the threat of a strike. The union and the industry have been experimenting with a labor-management committee—a joint study com-

A3996

June 24

institution of learning. No small measure of the success is due Superintendent G. W. Bannerman, the energetic and widely recognized educator who has insisted upon one of the finest high school staffs anywhere.

Cited particularly for his leadership was Mr. Taylor, who, while comparatively new on the job as principal, has pushed for new and higher goals for our school. As the award citation states, he has "presented an image deserving of the Bellamy Award."

Teachers were specifically cited for "exceptionally high caliber" and for having "tireless devotion" and being "without jealousies."

Students have demonstrated good citizenship and patriotism which has made their school worthy of the award.

Other specific reasons are cited for granting the award to Wausau High, including one that says that the "local press is thorough in promoting a good local educational system," according to Miss Margarette Miller, Portsmouth, Va., director of the award. We are particularly proud of that statement because a good educational system is a continuing objective of this newspaper.

But giving credit where credit is due, the award was won, as previously stated, by outstanding administration, teachers and students. We salute you, educators, and students.

No Job Discrimination in Washington County, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following article on nondiscriminatory hiring policies practiced by the overwhelming majority of business establishments in Washington County, Md. The intensive study by the United Church Women of Washington County reveals the progress which has been made in achieving equality of job opportunity for all county citizens. The report calls attention to those factors other than discrimination which prevent Negroes from obtaining jobs. The Congress of the United States would be wise to reflect on these factors with an eye to considering remedial legislation in this important area.

JOB BIAS UNSEEN AT 23 FIRMS HERE

(By Harry Warner)

Twenty-three business establishments in Washington County employing 4,256 persons have reported that their personnel practices are completely nondiscriminatory with respect to race.

Ten of these establishments employ 57 Negroes at the present time. Thirteen of the employers, whose work force consists of 286 persons not including any Negroes at the present time, indicate that they would give consideration to qualified Negroes for any job in their employment when vacancies occur.

These figures are part of the report of an intensive study made by the United Church Women of Washington County in cooperation with the Washington County Council of Churches. The project grew out of a study entitled "Assignment: Race."

A special committee of the United Church Women, including Negro members, prepared

and distributed a questionnaire, with assurance to employers that names of persons and businesses would not be released and that only summary statistics would be issued.

The purpose of the project is to give encouragement to employers, to Negroes, and to the community at large for progress in human relations, and to strengthen the sense of Christian social responsibility for fair employment practices in Washington County.

The number of replies is sufficiently large and diverse, the committee believes, to indicate trends and to be representative. Members of the committee have expressed deep appreciation to the many employers and personnel officers who not only filled out the questionnaire but added explanation and interpretation, providing real help in the study.

Replies to the questionnaire were received from 243 businesses, employing 8,486 persons, including 214 Negroes.

Although 1960 census figures reported 23,379 employed in the county, this figure includes self-employed persons, businesses limited to members of the family of the proprietor, domestics, and jobs covered in a previous study of employment practices in hotels, motels, and restaurants. Other employers, some of whom employ a substantial number of persons, are not counted in the statistics in the committee's report, because these employers indicate that their records do not include information on race. Some employers answered only parts of the questionnaire.

Although the figures may not represent jobs vacant at the present time, 25 business places employing some Negroes indicate that a limited number of additional job classifications are open to Negroes.

A total of 52 employers who do not presently employ Negroes indicate that they have areas of work other than janitorial and maintenance which are open to Negroes; 19 employers offer only janitorial and maintenance work to Negroes; and 77 employers indicate they would employ Negroes in a limited number of other areas including professional positions, sales, secretarial, mechanical, and general office work.

Of those employers now providing jobs for Negroes, two indicated that Negroes are not eligible for advancement on the basis applied to white employees. Seven stated categorically they would not employ Negroes.

A limited number of businesses reported willingness to provide seasonal employment for white or Negro students. Five employers limited opportunities for such seasonal work to white students.

One of the more unexpected features in the replies was the report by 52 employers that no Negro has applied to them for employment. Fifteen employers said they had received applications from Negroes not qualified for the jobs they were seeking.

Correspondence attached to questionnaires returned and information supplied in interviews indicated these factors other than racial discrimination affecting employment of Negroes in Washington County: Competition for jobs due to high rate of unemployment, the influence of seniority in rehiring, the need of Negroes for more training, and the assumption, unwarranted in some instances, that employers would not hire Negroes even if they were qualified.

As a further development of this project, the United Church Women plan to prepare and make available to employers a file of job applications filled out by Negro young people who are recent graduates and by other young people who believe they could qualify for higher classifications of work than those in which they are presently employed.

Members of the Christian social relations committee of the United Church Women who prepared the questionnaire and par-

ticipated in its distribution are Mesdames Kenneth Adams, W. H. Arata, William H. Babylon, William H. Brish, J. Russell Butcher, Robert H. Dowle, Asher Edelman, Fred C. Ernst, W. Ronald Fearer, Walter C. Hollins, Aaron E. Johnson, Frank F. Lusby, Patsy Marks, Harry G. Miles, Howard Spessard, W. C. Schroeder, W. H. Stewart, Lawrence N. Strunk, George Whetstone, and Miss Ann Whitmore.

Members of the Washington County Council of Churches who cooperated in an advisory capacity are the Reverend W. Ronald Fearer, the Reverend G. Bartow Harris, the Reverend Ivan G. Naugle, and W. H. Stewart.

Chapman

Surrender to Castro?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has been moving closer and closer to appeasement with the Soviets and Castro. Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, in a very disturbing report, indicate what is going on. The President should be frank enough to state the same without hiding behind a New York attorney who has no business making foreign policy for the United States.

The report follows:

A SHIFT ON CASTRO STUDIED

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy is deliberating a gradual shift in U.S. policy toward Dictator Fidel Castro's Communist regime in Cuba.

For more than a month, the President and his top foreign policy advisers have been discussing a plan under which the United States would resume contact with Castro on both an informal and formal basis.

Under this backstage scheme, New York attorney James Donovan, who negotiated the \$53 million ransom of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners, would fly to Havana and Moscow to seek the withdrawal of all Soviet combat forces from Cuba.

In exchange for their removal, the United States would agree to a step-by-step normalization of diplomatic and trade relations with the Red-ruled Castro dictatorship over a 2-year period.

As a first step, the United States would reopen its Embassy in Havana by sending a Chargé d'Affaires there. At present the Swiss Ambassador is handling U.S. affairs.

An exchange of ambassadors and lifting of the trade embargo against Castro would follow after sufficient time had elapsed to make such a drastic readjustment palatable to the people and Congress.

This far-reaching shift in Cuban relations is part of President Kennedy's policy of seeking accommodations with Russia and its satellite bloc for the avowed purpose of reducing the risk of nuclear war by moderating tensions.

White House insiders say the proposed switch in Cuba policy fits squarely with strategy enunciated recently by the President in a speech that "Any plan of action in the Caribbean has to take into account conditions and potential developments between the United States and U.S.S.R."

The President favors 47-year-old Donovan for this highly explosive diplomatic mission for two reasons: His acceptability to Castro

1963

on bone formation. Our own blood is red because it contains a complex organic molecule containing iron. Some of the creatures that live in the oceans have blood that is green, however, because it contains copper. There is even a primitive kind of animal in the ocean, called the ascidian, whose blood contains the element vanadium. We need to know a great deal more about the functions of these metals in such biological systems, and again neutron activation may be the instrument that will tell us much which will ultimately be useful in maintaining human health and vigor.

A better understanding of the biochemical processes of aging may yet let us extend our lifetimes far beyond the Biblical three-score and ten. Improved medical care and prevention and even total eradication of many diseases may not be far off.

Yet an ever-increasing population, and one which lives longer and longer will bring with it a whole horde of new problems—social, economic, political, and particularly educational. The world will be more complex and the teacher's responsibilities and opportunities much greater.

It would seem that a shorter workweek, resulting from increased automation, will almost certainly appear. Our children will have more and more time available to them—theoretically—as leisure. Perhaps by 1993, the average office or factory worker will be putting in only a 24-hour workweek, with plenty of long weekends.

We are well aware of the quantitative demands that will be placed on undergraduate schools in the years ahead. It appears that, whereas some 18 percent, or 400,000, of the Nation's 22-year-olds took baccalaureate degrees in 1960, some 25 percent, or 875,000, will receive such degrees in 1970. If we keep as our goal the maintenance of high quality in education, these figures appear staggering. Yet we are not without experience with explosive expansion, although on a smaller scale, since in 1940 only 8 percent, or 190,000, of our 22-year-olds acquired baccalaureate degrees.

There is one suggestion about the undergraduate curriculum I should like to discuss in more detail. It has to do with the education of the generalist upon whom we depend so much for leadership and for informed influence in the democratic process. Let me define in part the problem of educating the generalist by considering the kind of individual who can live a consequential life in, and who can contribute significantly to, a free and dynamic scientific society. I believe he must have a firm grasp of his liberal-humanitarian heritage. He must comprehend the value of freedom and truth, and be sensitive to significance in art, literature, music and philosophy. He should be intellectually flexible, and receptive to new knowledge, and to new patterns of living as old worlds crumble. He must be able to differentiate between intrinsic and superficial values; to understand and act upon the knowledge that the value of creative evolution lies not in mere acquisition of material wealth and leisure but in the capacity of these things to help him achieve more meaningful fulfillment. He must be responsible, and contribute his full share, intelligently, to democratic processes.

My discussion here of the undergraduate curriculum will revolve about a single theme: that tens of thousands of young men and women are leaving the halls of higher education each year with allegedly liberal educations but who in fact have little or no knowledge of science. If a liberally educated person is one who can make critical judgments of his society and his

time, who today is liberally educated if he knows nothing about science? It would be foolhardy and undesirable to try to make every bright student a scientist. It would be impossible to stock a general student's head with scientific facts sufficient for him to be knowledgeable, even for a brief time after graduation, about the broad expanse of science. Yet it is most unfortunate to send him into a world evolving swiftly under the impact of scientific knowledge without a grasp of scientific method, an elementary understanding of the larger principles of science, an appreciation of the influence of science in philosophy, economics and history, and a knowledge of the power and dynamics of science in creative evolution.

The implications for your task of making critical decisions in higher education seem obvious. Your responsibility is to educate the leaders of tomorrow's world. That world will be dominated increasingly by science and technology. Wherever your future graduates go—into business, politics, industry, government, teaching, or whatever field—they will find their effectiveness and their rewards greatly increased by a knowledge of science. In the healthy working of the democratic process, a wider understanding of the dynamics of science is imperative. I believe that one of the critical decisions the participants in this Conference could make would be to work for a return of science to a significant place in general education.

It is not my suggestion that broad cultural instruction should be reduced at the expense of increased science content. A sound foundation in our cultural heritage, in appreciation of art, music, literature and human thought, is essential to the fulfillment made possible by creative evolution. Therefore, I would by no means confine my academic cross-fertilization to the inclusion of science-oriented professors in nonscience departments. Rather, I would give some appointments in the science departments to teachers who have special interests in the arts, the humanities and the social sciences—men who could relate these cultural interests to the natural sciences.

In these ways, I believe we could significantly increase literacy of science, as well as increase cultural literacy among scientists, without doing violence to the academic structure.

In connection with this whole area of cross-fertilization, I should like to mention a contribution that is being made by one of the Atomic Energy Commission laboratories, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Starting on June 17, Oak Ridge will conduct a 6-week summer institute of "Humanistic Discussions in Science." The institute is designed to provide nonscience university and college teachers with an increased awareness of science in general and nuclear science in particular in order that they may incorporate a fuller discussion of science within the context of their own disciplines. Participants in the institute will be selected primarily from departments of economics, government, history, philosophy, political science and sociology. An important consideration in selecting the 30 participants will be the applicant's degree of interest in science. I believe programs of this kind merit the careful consideration of the academic community.

I cite these developments as a prelude to another major recommendation for a critical decision in higher education: Namely, that you work to extend, as far as feasible, your graduate programs with the assistance of the Federal Government. There has been considerable debate about the desirability of Federal support, especially for faculty and facilities. I believe the experience of the post-World War II period, in which Federal Government has come to support more than

half of our scientific research, demonstrates that techniques can be developed which increase the capacities of our graduate schools without depriving them of their independence. The Federal Government appears to be a needed source of the funds required for the necessary expansion. It appears likely that growing support for Federal assistance will help place the ambitious goals of expansion of graduate education within reach.

In summary, we have inherited a revolutionary philosophical concept of man as an architect of his environment, a concept that seemed to flower only about two centuries ago. Men gained confidence in this idea when their economic energy and inventions brought unparalleled modifications of life through the industrial revolution. In the period starting some two decades ago, which may be designated as the beginning of the third revolution, Western man became irrevocably dedicated to the concept of creative evolution. The future of the third revolution—of man's power to mold the world to his liking—is almost unlimited.

Wausau High Gets National Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the senior high school at Wausau, Wis., has been selected as the 1964 winner of the Bellamy Flag Award.

Judging in the 23d annual competition for the Bellamy Award was limited to Wisconsin high schools. Wausau Senior High School won out over 73 other schools in Wisconsin for the honor.

The award presentation will take place October 11, 1964.

I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from the May 17, 1963 issue of the Wausau Daily Record-Herald printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WAUSAU HIGH GETS NATIONAL RECOGNITION

A high honor, one of a number received in recent years, has been bestowed upon Wausau Senior High School. There is every indication that our public high school richly deserves the national Bellamy Flag Award, perhaps the highest tribute ever paid the local institution and one which is highly coveted among the secondary schools of the Nation.

Only one such award is made each year in the United States. While judging was limited to Wisconsin schools this year, our school won out over 73 others nominated for the honor. We join a select list of 22 past winners, including Central High School, of Chattanooga, Tenn., the 1963 winner.

An indication of the importance of the award is that Principal Marshall Taylor has already received letters and telegrams of congratulations from 14 Governors, 18 Senators, 10 Congressmen and a host of other noted educators, Cabinet members, widely known entertainers and others.

There are three good reasons why the Bellamy Award will be presented at Wausau Senior High on October 11, 1964. They are: Administration, teachers, and students.

From the top, the Wausau Board of Education has set down ground rules which have made possible the growth of an outstanding